

I certainly am one mom who has had enough.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE AND THE ABM TREATY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, recent comments by several Russian Government officials about the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and our plans to deploy a national missile defense are very troubling to me. For example, the Russian Foreign Minister, Mr. Ivanov, was quoted last week as saying:

There . . . cannot be any bargaining with the Americans over the anti-ballistic missile defense.

This may be a clever negotiating tactic, but it is not a very productive one. It unnecessarily pushes the United States to make a choice between defending ourselves against limited ballistic missile threats and withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. We have already decided, by the adoption of the National Missile Defense Act, that we will defend ourselves as soon as technologically feasible against limited ballistic missile attack. We should not be forced to withdraw from the treaty.

The Russians should understand that our system is directed at rogue threats and will not jeopardize their strategic deterrent force. We have an opportunity to work cooperatively to ensure that we are protected, both Russia and the United States, against emerging ballistic missile threats without undermining strategic deterrence.

The ABM Treaty needs to be changed to permit the deployment of defenses against limited ballistic missile threats and to allow the parties to utilize new defensive technologies. There should be no restrictions, for example, on the use of sensor capabilities such as the space-based infrared system and cooperative engagement capability. We should also be able to take advantage of new basing modes and advanced technologies such as the airborne laser.

The ABM Treaty must be interpreted to allow the parties to use the best technologies that are available in their own defense against rogue threats. The strategic deterrent of each nation can be preserved at the same time limited missile defenses are permitted and considered acceptable under the ABM Treaty.

Another Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman said last week:

Russia does not see as acceptable such an "adaptation" of this treaty. Russia will not be a participant in destroying the ABM Treaty.

The Russian Government's contention that adapting the ABM Treaty to modern realities is akin to destroying it is unfortunate. In fact, the opposite is true. To refuse to adapt this treaty to the new realities is to guarantee its irrelevance.

One reality is the new ballistic missile threat. The other is that the United States is going to respond to this threat and protect itself by deploying a missile defense system. The sooner the Russians understand our commitment to defend ourselves, the more likely it is we can agree to sensible modifications of the ABM Treaty for our mutual benefit and safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAVING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the beginning of this congressional session was filled with hope and promise. A strong economy and improvements in the Federal budget gave us a wonderful opportunity to make important investments in our Nation's future. A portion of these surpluses could be used to extend the solvency of the Social Security program. A portion of the surplus could be used to restore solvency to Medicare and to modernize its benefit structure to reflect current medical practices. A portion of the surplus could be used, as was urged in the full-page ad in the Washington Post of October 28, "to use this opportunity to preserve our parks and open spaces forever." This could be accomplished by such things as fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and a portion of the surplus could be used to fund tax relief and economic stimulation.

Instead of devoting the surplus to these important matters, Congress is dribbling away the surplus with a combination of get-out-of-town spending and budgetary trickery. Our actions—emergency spending, scorekeeping adjustments, administrative directives—have one simple result: They are spending our surplus. Once current revenues are spent, the non-Social Security surplus will be spent and the Social Security surplus will be spent. If Congress continues on this gimmick-potholed path, we will be harshly judged by the American people for our shortsightedness.

On October 4 of this year, the Washington Post ran an article on the 10-year anniversary of the reunification of Germany. In that article, Wolfgang Schäuble, the Christian Democratic leader and Chancellor Kohl's most trusted adviser, lamented the fact that Germans had avoided making the tough political choices 10 years ago that would have made their country stronger today. The spirit of reunification created an atmosphere for reform. The Germans could have used that spirit to make fundamental changes to their overly generous social contract that all acknowledged was

unsustainable. They deferred, and the result was a tripling of the national debt in less than a decade.

We face the same choice today. Our positive economic outlook creates a similar potential for the United States. The budget surplus gives us the resources to convert a substantial part of that potential to reality.

At the beginning of the year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated we would have a non-Social Security surplus of \$21 billion. What have we done in the last 10 months? The combination of excessive spending and the budget trickery designed to disguise even greater spending have placed the on-budget surplus in serious jeopardy and threatened to undermine the Social Security surplus. These actions—spend and then hide—have occurred in waves throughout 1999. As with our coastline, no single wave erodes our beaches. Rather, it is a succession of waves that erodes the sand. These spending waves have eroded our surplus, eroded our opportunities, eroded our vision of what could be accomplished.

In May of 1999, the Congress passed a supplemental appropriations bill which provided for \$15 billion for everything from reconstruction aid for Central America and the Caribbean to farm loan assistance. Much of the May supplemental bill was designated as an emergency. No spending cuts or revenue increases were enacted to offset the emergency spending contained in that May 1999 supplemental appropriation. The consequence? A \$15 billion reduction in the non-Social Security surplus.

The May supplemental appropriations lowered for 1999 the surplus by \$4 billion. That was a significant number because without that additional \$4 billion of unpaid-for spending, we would have actually ended 1999 with an on-budget surplus. But because of it, we have ended 1999 with an on-budget deficit of \$1 billion.

The May supplemental will lower the current fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus by \$7 billion. It will lower the next fiscal year 2001 by \$2 billion; 2002 by \$1 billion; and 2003 by \$1 billion.

By this action, we not only adversely affected the fiscal status of the year in which the action was taken but for 4 years into the future.

This chart shows we started with a \$21 billion on-budget surplus; as a result of that portion of the supplemental appropriations which was applied to fiscal year 2000, we reduced it by \$7 billion. So now we only have a \$14 billion on-budget surplus.

The next wave hit in August of 1999, the Agriculture Appropriations Act: \$8 billion of emergency spending, again, none of which was offset by reductions in spending elsewhere or increased revenues. So we have reduced the on-budget surplus by another \$8 billion from \$14 billion to \$6 billion.

In October of 1999, the Defense appropriations bill included more than \$7